"The Mysterious Paiśācī"

By ALFRED MASTER

KONOW'S "The Home of Paiśācī" (24 pages) was printed in *ZDMG.*, 1910, and Grierson's reply (38 pages) in *ZDMG.*, 1912. Konow concluded that "the Paiśācī described by Prakrit grammarians was based upon a dialect spoken in and about the Vindhyas, and perhaps further to the south and east" (p. 118). Grierson believed that "the home in India of the Piśācas was in the North-West of India, where these (the 'modern Piśāca') languages are spoken, and that —— the nidus of Paiśācī Prakrit was also in the North-West" (p. 85). The theories of previous scholars as stated by Konow and Grierson were that Pai. was a hill dialect (Lassen), a low Prakrit spoken by Dravidians identifiable with Apabhraṃśa (Hoernle), a Prakrit of the North-West (Pischel), and (the Pai. of Guṇāḍhya, author of the Bṛhatkathā only) based upon an Aryan language of the north-west or west, but spoken by non-Aryan peoples (Lacôte).

The discussion was reopened by Konow with a new argument in *JRAS.*, 1921 (pp. 244 f.), to which Grierson replied (pp. 424 f.), but neither argument nor reply threw much fresh light on the subject. In the meantime A. C. Woolner (*Intro. to Pkt.*, p. 68) had observed that the term Paiśācī was used in several senses and that one of these was that of an uncivilized language. H. Jacobi (Bhav. § 82) confined himself to saying that the Bṛhatkathā, the only work regarded by tradition to have been written in Pai., set the example for a style, imitated in other dialects. Grierson also thought that Pai. was used in parts of India other than the north-west and states (*JRAS.*, 1921, p. 426) that the only issue between Konow and himself was the site of the home of Pai.

The latest view is that of A. B. Keith in *The History of Sanskrit Literature*, 1928, p. 28. He says, "To the group of old Prākrits belongs also the mysterious Paiçācī, in which the famous Bṛhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya was written; its home is still uncertain." He considers Grierson's attribution open to objection on many grounds and that there is much to be said for Konow's theory. Konow's arguments are indeed sounder than Grierson's. Unfortunately, the problem has never been accurately stated and, in its present

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00098154 Published online by Cambridge University Press

form, bristles with *petitiones principii*. Pai. is not necessarily a Prakrit; the Bṛh. may not have been written in Pai. and Pai. need not have had a home. How is it that these points have been missed by so many eminent scholars? Apparently for want of other material, much reliance was placed upon Namisādhu and the later grammarians, Hemacandra and his successors who based their statements about Pai. either on second-hand evidence or their own theories, influenced by the popular meaning of the word Paiśācī. Further, the authenticity of the last three chapters of Vararuci's Prākṛta-prakāśa (5th to 7th cent.) had not then been questioned and no one doubted the existence of the term Paiśācī in his time. Pai. is distinguished from Pkt. and Apa. by several grammarians of the tenth century and need not therefore be a prakrit in the sense that Śauraseni is a prakrit (i.e. a regional adaptation of Mahārāṣṭrī). The Bṛh. was written in Bhūtabhāṣā according to the earliest authorities and it was only later that Bhūtabhāśā was identified with Pai. Rājaśekhara (*c.* 900 A.D.) appears to suggest that it had a home, but in the same breath he connects the Gauḍa country with Skt., the Lāṭa country with Pkt. and Marwār and the Ṭakka country[1] (Panjab) with Apa. Clearly he is speaking only of the literary language favoured by various peoples without implying that it was closely connected with their vernacular.

As to the Bṛhatkathā. This work was written in a language not Skt., Pkt., Apa., or a bhāṣā (vernacular of the writer). This language was known later as Paiśācī. The first mention of the Bṛh. is in the copperplate grants of Durvinīta. Keith (op. cit., p. 268, n. 2) writes: "The alleged version into Sanskrit by Durvinīta (? 6th century) is quite dubious (R. Narasimhachar, *JRAS.*, 1913, pp. 389 ff.); see Fleet, *JRAS.*, 1911, pp. 186–8." Durvinīta was, however, a Western Ganga king, whose date can be traced backwards from Śrīpuruṣa to *c.* 580 A.D., his approximate date of accession. Fleet, at first, condemned all the Ganga records as forgeries, and refused to recognize a Ganga dynasty. But later he allowed that one or two might be genuine. The beautiful execution, the careful Sanskrit, and the palæographical details of the Uttanūr plates all confirm Narasimhachar's judgment that they are genuine. These plates (*MAR.*, 1912, p. 65, and 1916, p. 36) contain the words "devabhāratī-nibaddha-Vaḍḍakathena Kirātârjunīye

[1] Bhādānaka, the third country mentioned by Rāj, has not been identified.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00098154 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pancadaśa-[1] sargga-ṭīkā-kāreṇa Durvvinīta-nāmadheyena". *EC.*, xii, Tumkur 23, has "devabhāratī-nibaddha-Bṛhatkathaḥ".[2] It is doubtful whether these words mean, as Narasimhachar suggests, "made a translation of the Bṛh. in Skt." It seems rather to mean "he, who composed the Bṛh. in the language of the gods". There is no exact parallel to the use of devabhāratī as meaning Skt. and we assume that Durvinīta wrote his two other works (of which Śabdâvatāra was the third) in Skt. Daṇḍin, indeed, says that mahārṣis call Skt. daivī vāc (i, 37); Bhojadeva says that gods., etc., speak Skt. (ii, 9); Namisādhu says, however, "ārisavayaṇe siddhaṃ devānaṃ Addhamāgahā vāṇī" (in the Ārṣa text it is established that Ardhamāgadhī is the speech of the gods), comm. on Rudraṭa, Kavya. ii, 12. Still, even if the meaning of the phrase is uncertain, it seems, at least, to indicate that Durvinīta was acquainted with the Bṛh.

The next references to the Bṛh. occur in the works of Subandhu Bāṇa and Daṇḍin, all of whom flourished in the seventh century. Bhāravi, whose date Keith (*HSL.*, p. 108) gives as *c.* A.D. 550, makes no mention of the Bṛh. According to the Avantisundarī-kathā, which Keith rejects, Bhāravi was a friend of Durvinīta, when they were exiles at the court of the Pallava Simhaviṣṇu (*c.* A.D. 575, cf. A. Master, *JRAS.*, 1939, p. 79). This would explain Durvinīta's interest in the Kirātārjuniya. It is possible also to relate Bhāravi's pride in his grammatical skill (cf. Keith, *HSL.*, p. 114) with Durvinīta's interest in philology, as shown by his composition of the Śabdâvatāra, and his choice of the artificial Canto XV of the Kirātârjuniya for comment. Bhāravi's devotion to Śiva (he is called mahāśaiva in the Avantisundari-kathā) shown in the Kirātârjuniya and the conceits of Canto XV (which are paralleled in later Tamil tradition)[3] are consistent with a Dravidian connection. His interest in words and the example of Bhāravi in making his hero the wild mountaineer Kirāta may have suggested to Durvinīta the compilation of popular tales in a mountain setting.[4]

[1] I have not used ṅ, ñ before the k and c vargas, so nk and nc = ṅk, ñc, etc.

[2] For the equivalence vaḍḍo = bṛhat, cf. Vṛhadgachasya in Nemicandra's Uttarādhana-ṭīkā IOC ii 7488 śloka 9 and Vaḍḍagacchammi in his Mahavīra-carita Pattan Cat. 285 śloka 2 (A.D. 1060). Also Amg vaḍḍa-kumāri "adult unmarried girl".

[3] Cf. J. Vinson, *Langue tamoule*, p. 228, quoting C. J. Beschi's much admired quatrain of four almost identical lines each with a different meaning.

[4] An excellent account of the various versions of the Brh., based upon, among other sources, the *Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā* (Lacôte, 1908), is given in Keith, *HSL.*, pp. 266 ff.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00098154 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Subandhu mentions the Bṛh. twice and Guṇāḍhya once (F. Hall, *Vāśavadattā BI.*, 1859, pp. 110, 147), and Guṇāḍhya is not again mentioned until A.D. 875 in a Cambodian inscription. The Bṛh. is not mentioned in the ninth century. Dhanaṃjaya in the Daśarūpa (exact date unknown), Trivikrama A.D. 915 and Somadeva Sūrī A.D. 959 mention it in the tenth century. Dhanapāla, *c.* A.D. 972, says that the Skt. kathās are derived from the Bṛh. (Tilakamanjarī, cf. Lacôte, *EGB.*, p. 10). In the eleventh century appears the Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva (*c.* 1070), and the Bṛhatkathāmanjarī of Kṣemendra (*c.* 1045). The fragmentary Bṛhatkathāśloka-saṃgraha of Budhasvāmin may be contemporary or somewhat earlier. They are all written in Skt. and have wandered far from the original source. The position regarding the Bṛh. is (to quote Keith) that we cannot say anything definite of the date of Guṇāḍhya, the question of the form of the work is obscure and it is impossible to determine with precision the content of the Bṛh.

I shall now examine the assertion (*HSL.*, p. 269) that the dialect used was Paiśācī.

The Language of the Bṛhatkathā

If the term Paiśācī meant no more than the language spoken or written by certain Piśācas at a certain time, there could be no objection to its use. This appears to be Lacôte's original view, although he tries to fit in Grierson's north-west theory. But the word describing the language of the Vindhyan Piśācas is, according to the earliest authorities, Bhūtabhāṣā. The Bṛh. was, according to the story of the recensions, told by Śiva to Pārvatī. This story may explain the use by Durvinīta of the word devabhāratī "the speech of the gods". The kathā was finally written by Guṇāḍhya in the language of the Vindhya Piśācas.

anyonyālāpam eteṣāṃ durād ākarṇya
śikṣitā mayā Piśācabhāṣā. Kathāsaritsāgara śl. 27

"By listening from afar to their talk with one another, I learnt the language of the Piśācas."

He therefore saluted Kāṇabhūti in their language, which he calls the fourth, the Bhūtabhāṣā.

dṛṣṭvā tvāṃ svāgataṃ kṛtvā caturthyā bhūtabhāṣyā.

Bhūtabhāṣā is called the fourth language, because Guṇāḍhya had taken a vow not to use Skt., Pkt., or deśabhāṣā.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00098154 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tato mayā
Saṃskṛtaṃ Prākṛtaṃ tadvad deśabhāṣā ca sarvadā
bhāṣātrayam idaṃ tyaktaṃ, yan manuṣyeṣu sambhavet

"Thereupon I renounced for ever Sanskrit, Prakrit, and likewise deśabhāṣā, this triad of speech, such as it occurs among men," id., śl. 147–8.

This śloka contradicts the widely accepted classification of Bhūtabhāṣā as a prakrit. Prākṛta cannot mean merely Mahārāṣṭrī because the differences between that variety and Śaurasenī, Magadhī, etc., were not so important as to enable Guṇāḍhya to claim one of the latter as a separate language. Bhūtabhāṣā is not even a deśabhāṣā which was still further removed from Sanskrit than the prakrits (or Prakrit in the sense of Mahārāṣṭrī and its dialects). The triple classification of languages into Skt., Pkt., and deśabhāṣā with a fourth bhāṣā outside of and different from them is consonant with the classification of the Nāṭyaśāstra (*c.* 4th cent.) into Saṃskṛta, Prākṛta, and deśabhāṣā with the corresponding triple (trividhaṃ) division of words into samāna-śabda, vibhraṣṭa, and deśī (xvii, 14). Deśabhāṣās are apparently local dialects (such as Śauraseni, Māgadhī, etc.) used in drama, perhaps in correspondence and business notes, but not in literature.[1] The work also recognizes vibhāṣās, which are the languages now classed as Dravidian and Muṇḍā. Dharasena's inscription (*c.* A.D. 560) speaks of Saṃskṛta, Prākṛta, Apabhraṃśa bhāṣā-traya, the triad of speeches. Here Apa. appears to mean a standardized literary language suitable for use with a few modifications by speakers of the main deśabhāṣās, but no mention is made of deśabhāṣās or of vibhāṣās.[2] It appears that at this period writers were more conscious of the difference between Indo-Aryan and non-I.A. languages than later, for Śabara (*c.* fifth century A.D.) gives in his Bhāṣya examples of four mleccha words (two Iranian and two Dravidian) and Kumārila (seventh century) adduces five words of Draviḍa, which he calls one of the mleccha languages (Tantravārtika, see Iyengar, *IA.*, xlii, p. 200).[3] Kumārila protests against the attempt of certain writers to

[1] In a few points of detail this account may differ from that of H. Jacobi in his *Essay on Apabhraṃśa, Bhavisatta-kahā*, pp. 55 ff.

[2] Apabhraṃśa may mean a corruption of Skt., not of Pkt., as in Patanjali's Mahābhāṣya, and thus refer to early Middle Indian.

[3] They are well known and all identifiable except one, which appears to be a dialectal form (māl, "female" = āl, "person, boy, girl, servant"; Koṛava āmḷ, *LSI.*, iv, 321). As for mleccha, many derivations have been suggested, but I have not yet seen suggested *malepsu, "devotee of darkness, obscurity," cf. malinamukha "goblin."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00098154 Published online by Cambridge University Press

manipulate these words and so distort their meaning as to make them appear to be Skt. words. The movement, then, to regard Skt. as the mother of all Indian languages, had begun, but had not yet gained universal acceptance. Bhūtabhāṣā was still outside the Sanskritic triad ranked, no doubt, as mleccha. The word Bhūtabhāṣā is met again in the comments of Narasiṃha Vaidya and Jayaddhara on Subandhu's Vāśavadattā. The former calls Guṇāḍhya "the author of a kind of composition known as Bhūtabhāṣā" (bhūtabhāṣākhyo granthabhedaḥ Guṇāḍhyas-tatkartā), "the exponent of Bhūtabhāṣā" (pranetṛ), and the latter speaks of him as "the mighty poet of Bhūtabhāṣā" (bhūtabhāṣā-kavi-vṛṣo). Bhāmaha (last half of seventh century A.D.) speaks like Dharasena of the Triad (saṃskṛtaṃ prākṛtaṃ cānyad apabhraṃśa iti tridhā, quoted by Jac. *Bhav.*, p. 54), and has no occasion to speak of Bhūtabhāṣā. Daṇḍin, who may be regarded as a contemporary, makes the Triad[1] into a Tetrad by including Miśra to provide for the non-homogeneous character of the Drama. The classification is faulty, as no new language is intended. He retains the Nāṭyaśāstra's triple classification of words, but for Prakrit, introducing the terms tatsama, tadbhava, and deśī. He is the first to call the language of the Bṛh. Bhūtabhāṣā. This name may have been suggested by Bāṇa's description of the Vṛhatkathā [*sic*] as a marvel (Cowell and Thomas, *Harṣacaritra*, p. 3), for Daṇḍin repeats this idea in the phrase adbhutârtham Bṛhatkathām, making a play on the words bhūta and adbhuta.

There is then a gap of nearly a hundred years till Ujjoaṇa's Kuvalayamālā, which describes without reference to the Bṛh., the Triad, Pesāyā or Pesāya-bhāsa, and the eighteen deśabhāṣās (*GOS.*, xxxvii, Intro., *passim*). This work (A.D. 777) marks a fresh stage, in which Bhūtabhāṣā is identified with a specific language Paiśācā and is not merely Piśācabhāṣā. This stage will be described later. But the language in which the Bṛh. was originally written, whether it was known at the time as Bhūtabhāṣā or what Bhūtabhāṣā means, is still a problem. Bhūtabhāṣā may even mean "obsolete language", a language forgotten or "the language of Śiva", who is bhūteśvara, bhūtacārin, bhūtanātha, etc.[2] The

[1] Daṇḍin's *Apabhraṃśa* is not a successor of Skt., "as in the Śāstras" (Kavya. i, 36), but of Pkt., cf. the later writers (PG 2). There is no place, therefore, in the Triad for early Middle Indian.

[2] R. G. Bhandarkar, *Wilson Philo. Lectures*, 1877, p. 79, calls Pai "the language of the ghosts".

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00098154 Published online by Cambridge University Press

earliest title of this work Vaḍḍakathā, however, seems to indicate that it was written in one of the eighteen Deśabhāṣas, which included non-Aryan languages spoken in India. For vaḍḍa is not Skt. or Pkt.[1] and kathā not Pkt. or Apa.

The Piśācas

The word Pesāyā or Paiśācā, etc., means "the language of Piśācas". Grierson held that the Piśācas were a tribe, which lived at the time of the Mahābhārata in N.W. India and spoke a language, from which the modern Dardic and Kafir groups are descended. The language spread to many other parts of India including the Vindhyas. Apart from Grierson no scholar has ever believed that Piśāca was more than a vague name for wild tribes, especially as there now exist neither Piśācas nor a Piśāca language. Keith (*HSL.*, p. 259) sets out Konow's suggestion that the Paiśācī of the Vindhyas was a Prakrit influenced by Dravidian. This view is based upon the fragments of the language cited by the later grammarians as Paiśācī. The Piśācas of the Vindhyas must, then, at one time have been speakers of Dravidian. But probably the inhabitants of the Vindhyas were not of Dravidian race. The Vindhyas are now inhabited by Bhīls and similar races, who are regarded by anthropologists as aboriginal and probably of the same race as the Muṇḍā tribes. Who inhabited the Vindhyas in the fifth or sixth century A.D., when the Bṛh. may have been written? The nearest contemporary evidence appears to be that of Subandhu, who depicts the Vindhya range as occupied by Pulindas, Kirātas, and Śabaras (Hall, op. cit., p. 32). Bāṇa (early seventh century A.D.) writes: "There is a general of the Śabaras, named Bhūkampa, lord of all this Vindhya range" (Cowell and Thomas, *Harṣacaritra*, p. 232). Haribhadra (*c.* early eighth century A.D.) refers in the last story of his Samarāiccakahā to a Śabara king of the Vindhyas. The host of Piśācas, which Guṇāḍhya meets in the Vindhyas were, therefore, probably Śabaras. The Savaras are still widespread in the east of India, but many have Aryan forms of speech. Some still speak Savara (Sora) in the Muṇḍā group of languages, of which Kūrkū is now the westernmost outpost in the Satpura and Mahadeo Hills, not far from the Vindhyas. The Bhīls, who now inhabit the Vindhyas, speak an old dialect of Gujarati. If the Bhīls are descended

[1] It is, however, found in vaḍḍa-kumārī "an old maid" (Munisri Ratnachandraji, *ArdhaMagadhi Dictionary*).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00098154 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from Śabaras, there has been a double change of language. If not, there has been a complete change of population. And this possibility of lack of continuity, which exists for N.W. India equally with the Vindhyas, has not been considered by Grierson.

Grierson (*ZDMG.*, 1912, p. 60) identifies the Piśācas [1] with the Yakṣas and connects them with the Rākṣasas, pointing out that the three were descended from sons of Kaśyapa, who is associated with Kashmir. But already by the time of the Rāmāyaṇa (third or fourth century B.C.) Rāvaṇa is the legendary lord of the Rākṣasas in Ceylon and the Pāli epics Dīpavaṃsa and Mahāvaṃsa (*c.* fourth to fifth centuries A.D.) record that at the time of the arrival of Vijaya Ceylon was inhabited by Yakkhas. The distinction between these three kinds of savage peoples is retained in the Kathāsaritsāgara. In chapter ii these words occur, "The Piśāca, whom you see here, was once a Yakṣa, a servant of Kuvera. He made a friend of the Rākṣasa Sthūlaśiras (Big-head). When Kuvera saw him with this shameful creature, he condemned him to be a Piśāca in the Vindhya mountains." Budhasvāmin speaks of the nirghṛṇa Draviḍa as rākṣasa, contrasting them with the humane speakers of Gauḍabhāṣā (*Ślokasaṃgraha*, xviii, 394). The source of the recensions may therefore have used rākṣasa as an epithet for the Dravidians and piśāca for the Śabaras. But from no standpoint can we infer that Piśāca ever denoted a race speaking a particular type of language.

Derivations of Piśāca

On the evidence it is possible only to guess the language in which the Bṛh. was written. But what was the origin of the words piśāca and paiśācī and what the nature of the language known to the later writers as Paiśācī?

Grierson stresses the identification of Piśāca with the raw-meat-eater of the Greek geographers and the cannibal of Pliny. He is supported by the description of Piśācas in the Vedas as kravyād (Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, i, 573). But Agni is also so described. G.'s association of piśāca with piśita "flesh" is probably not phonological, for piśitam "raw meat" is referable to piś (Lat. pingo) "paint", which acquires a secondary meaning of "red" in piśanga (cf. pinga, pinj, and pinjara). Piśāca may

[1] Peshāwar, N.W. India, may be Paiśācapura, but to balance it there was Pisājipadakam, near Nāsik (second century A.D., *Bom. Gaz.*, xvi, p. 552), Skt. Piśācīpadrakam.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00098154 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contain a reference to their colour, but probably the word is connected with a Dravidian root pey "angry, cruel, mad, devil" (appearing also in vey "hot", vairi "enemy"). Tam. pēy "demon", Kan. pē "madness", pēṃkuḷi "demon, madness", pētu[1] "demon, confusion of mind", are specific forms of this root. The idea of "mad, confused" exists to-day in Mar. pisāḷ- "be mad", pisā "mad", piśāna-devaru "crazy fellow" (of Kan. origin, but obsolete in Kan.). Mar. piśāca-lipi "crazy script" is the term applied to Moḍī and N. M. Penzer (editor of Tawney's *Ocean of Story*, p. 92) writes, "natives call the English language piśāca-bhāṣā goblin language, as to them it appears only as gibberish." The word piśāca recalls an obsolete Drav. form *pic*pec (cf. Kan. pisaru "infatuation", Tel. pisa "folly"). Hem. (i, 177, 193) gives the Pkt. forms pisāji,[2] pisallo, and pisāo, which suggest an original pisa. If the root is Drav., it may have been applied first to Śabaras by Dravidians, but has no connection with raw meat. It would not be worth while making this point, for clearly the kind of people to be called piśāca may have been eaters of raw meat, were it not that it is important to show that the connection of piśāca with the meaning "confusion of mind" is ancient and that the term is likely to have been used in the past for people whose language was unintelligible. This is the best explanation of the substitution of Paiśācī for Bhūtabhāṣā by the later writers and their attempt to find a dialect, which would illustrate their theories.

PAIŚĀCĪ: THE LANGUAGE

Ujjoaṇa, who first mentions Pai. as a language (A.D. 777), does so under the names Pesāya-bhāsillā and Pesāyā. Until his time Apabhraṃśa was "a collective term employed to denote literary languages not Sanskrit or Prākrit", as Keith states (*HSL.*, p. 32) following Jacobi. Or alternatively it is the vernacular of the Āhiras as used for literary purposes and adopted with suitable modifications by speakers of other vernaculars. But it tended to become stylized, a process which culminated in the extremely regular Apabhraṃśa of Jinadatta Sūri (fl. A.D. 1100), who celebrates in his Caccarī[3]

[1] Pāli peta "dead, deceased, ghost, demon" (Skt. preta), with no idea of madness. Tam. pētu "mental derangement", Tel. pēda "timid", have no sense of "demon" and the Kan. meaning is therefore borrowed from pēta.

[2] Pisāji is found in the Nāsik inscription of Puḷumāyi, *Bom. Gaz.*, xvi, p. 552.

[3] *GOS.*, xxxvii, text, pp. 1 ff. See also *JRAS.*, 1938, pp. 67–9, "Note on List of Tod MSS. No. 114."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00098154 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the praises of the poet and grammarian Jinavallabha Sūri. Ujjoaṇa employs Pesāyā as a collective term to denote languages not Skt., Pkt., or Apa. His hero hears a language which puzzles him and thinks, "This is not Sanskrit, Prakrit, or Apabhraṃśa. It must therefore be Paiśācā" (fol. 57–8, *GOS.*, xxxvii, pp. 97–8). The editor omits to give a specimen of the language to which he refers and the complete text of the Kuvalaya-mālā is at present unavailable.

Rudraṭa (*c.* A.D. 840) is the originator of what were known afterwards as the ṣaḍbhāṣā (e.g. Lakṣmīdhāra, sixteenth century). They are Skt., Pkt., Māgadha, Piśācabhāśā, Śaurasenī, and Apabhraṃśa. It is not clear why this classification is made and Rudraṭa does not use the terms paiśācā or paiśācī, but Piśācabhāṣā (gibberish). A Cambodian inscription (*c.* A.D. 875) describes Guṇāḍhya as prākṛtāpriyaḥ "enemy of Prakrit", and the Kavirājamārgga, a Kan. work of *c.* A.D. 860, recognizes only Sakkada, Pāgadam, Paḷa-Gannaḍam (Old Kanarese), and Kannaḍam,[1] and makes no mention of Daṇḍin's classification, although it is clearly founded on the Kāvyadarśa, many ślokas from which it translates.

Rājaśekhara (*c.* A.D. 900) reverts to the Tetrad of Ujjoaṇa in his Kāvya-mimaṃsa. The Kāvya-puruṣa has Skt. for his head, Pkt. for his arms, Apa. for his loins, and Paiśāca for his feet (*GOS.*, i[3], p. 6). But Rāj. prefers the term bhūtabhāṣā. Thus he refers to the use of Bhūtabhāṣā by the poets of Avanti, the Pariyātrā mountains and Daśapura (the Malwa region). S. Konow makes much of this as indicating the "home of Paiśācī" (*JRAS.*, 1921, p. 244), but as Rāj. also says that the Gauḍas use Skt., the men of Lāṭa prefer Pkt., and the men of Maru, Ṭakka, and Bhādānaka (Marwar and part of the Panjab), all employ Apa., it is clear that no such conclusion can be drawn. Rāj. may be generalizing from the legendary connection of Guṇāḍhya with Ujjain, as recounted in the Nepālamāhātmya (Keith, *HSL.*, p. 267).

The use of the forms pesāyā and paiśācaṃ instead of the longer piśāca-bhāṣā marks the recognition of the language as a literary entity, no longer a vague gibberish. The first to use the word paiśācikam is the Kanarese poet and metricist Nākiga or Nāgavarmma (*c.* A.D. 990). He writes (Chandassu usually known as Chandōmbudhī 67, p. 22 Kittel's edition) as follows.

Adentendoḍe[2] Saṃskṛtaṃ Prākṛtam Apabhraṃśaṃ Paiśācikam

[1] Or tamma nuḍi "our own tongue".
[2] adu entu enda oḍe "what is that, if it be said".

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00098154 Published online by Cambridge University Press

emba mūṟu-v-are bhāṣagaḷoḷ puṭṭuva Draviḍ-Āndhra-Karṇāṭak-ādi ṣaṭpancāsat sarva-viṣaya-bhāṣā-jātigaḷ akkuṃ.

" In reply to possible queries, there will be the fifty-six varieties of language, Tamil, Telugu, and Kanarese, etc., which originate from the three and a half languages, Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhraṃśa, and Paiśācika to wit."

Here two points are to be noticed. The Dravidian languages are claimed as included in the Skt. group, i.e. they are no longer Mleccha, and one of the languages, presumably Paiśācī, is described as only half a language. In one MS. only the languages are stated to be four. The phrase " three and a half languages " is also used by the ubhaya-kavi-cakravartti Ponna or Ponniga, " emperor of poets in Skt. and Kan. " (*c.* A.D. 980).[1] No reason is given for calling Pai. half a language. It may possibly indicate the non-Sanskritic element in Dravidian languages, but this is a surmise.

The Daśarūpa of Dhanaṃjaya (last quarter of tenth century) refers to the language as Paiśāca (Pischel, *PG.*, § 27).

The first use of the word paiśācī is found in the Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇa of Bhojadeva (say A.D. 1030), associated with Bhūtabhāṣā and Bhūtavacana (Pischel, id.). Namisādhu (fl. A.D. 1068) speaks of Paiśācika and Paiśācikī in his commentary on Rudraṭa (Pischel, id.). After this period all the forms mentioned above are in use, but Paiśācī is perhaps the most common. There are two interesting undated uses, one the word paiśācī in chapter x of the Prākṛta-prakāśa, and the other the word paiśācikī in Caṇḍa's Prakṛtalakṣaṇa (iii, 38). L. Nitti-Dolci has proved in her notable contribution to the history of Pkt. grammar in *Les grammariens prakrits*, 1938,[2] that the three last chapters of the Prākṛta-prakāśa cannot be the work of Vararuci. The use of the word paiśācī seems to date them and the imperfect commentary (which cannot be ascribed to Bhāmaha), *c.* A.D. 1000. Keith, *HSL.*, p. 433, believes that there are two recensions of Caṇḍa's work, one older than Vararuci and the other younger. But the word paiśācikī seems to date the particular sutra *c.* A.D. 1100.

Further, in a sūtra, which Hoernle discards (*CD.*, 11), a quotation is made from the Paramātmaprakāśa (Dūhā) 86 of Joinda or

[1] Śāntipūrāṇa, quoted by L. Rice, *KBB.*, p. iv. The dates assigned by Rice before the two Nāgavarmmas were distinguished (by R. Narasimhachar in *Kāvyāvalōkamam and Karṇāṭaka-bhāṣā-bhuṣaṇa Introduction*) have been revised.

[2] Cited as *GP.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00098154 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Yogīndra.[1] His date is unknown, but L. Alsdorf (*Apabhraṃśa Studien*, p. 60) states that his language gives him an impression of distinct lateness,[2] but requires a more complete examination. Now a colophon to a Paṭṭāvalī in praise of Jinadatta Sūri (*GOS.*, xxxvii, p. 112, note) runs: iti śrī Paṭṭāvalī: saṃ 1171 varṣe Pattana-mahānagare śrī Jayasiṃha-deva-vijayirājye; śrī Kharatara-gacche; Yogīndra-yugapradhāna-vasati-vāsi-śrī-Jinadatta-sūrīṇāṃ śiśyeṇa Brahmacandraganina likhitā. Yugapradhāna is a higher grade than sūri and until further evidence is available it can be presumed that Yogīndra the poet is Yogīndra the yugapradhāna, the host of the poet Jinadatta Sūri.[3] In A.D. 1113 Jinadatta was aged 39 and had been a sūri for two years (*GOS.*, xxxvii, Intro., p. 64). Jogīndra may have written the Paramātma-prakāśa twenty or thirty years before. The date of Caṇḍa's revisionists or of Caṇḍa himself, if the "revision", as is quite possible, consisted merely of rough notes for a revision, could not have been earlier than A.D. 1080. Nitti-Dolci from internal evidence believes that he is not necessarily prior to Hemacandra (Je n'oserais pas assurer d'après ces faits que Caṇḍa a été un des prédecesseurs de Hemacandra, *GP.*, p. 205).

After Namisādhu the terms Piśāca-bhāṣā, Paiśācī, Paiśācika, etc., were used as a rule indifferently with Bhūtabhāṣā. Rāmaśarman, however, appears to distinguish Paiśācī from Paiśāciṇka (Grierson, *EPG.*,[4] p. 124).

[1] One would expect Yogendra, but Yogīndra is well attested.

[2] "Y's sprache macht einen recht späten Eindruck, doch bedarf dies noch genauerer Prüfung."

[3] A. N. Upadhye, *Ann. Bhan. Inst.*, xii, pt. ii, pp. 132 ff., discusses Yogīndra and his works, but dates Caṇḍa much too early.

[4] Eastern School of Prakrit Grammarians and Paiśācī Prakrit.

(To be continued.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00098154 Published online by Cambridge University Press